

Appl. No.: 10/607,907
Amdt. dated October 15, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 30, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the preceding amendments and following remarks, which are responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed July 30, 2007. In response to the Office Action, Claims 5, 6, 24-25, 54-55, 70-71, and 88-89 have been canceled and Claims 1, 19, 26, 50, 65, 78, and 84 have been amended. Thus, following this amendment, Claims 1, 4, 9-19, 23, 26, 28, 50, 53, 56-65, 67-69, 74-78, 80-87, and 92-101 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 5-6, 24-25, 54-55, 70-71, and 88-89 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for containing the trademark/trade name "ActiveX" or "Netscape." Also, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4-6, 9-19, 23-26, 28-30, 50, 53-65, 67-71, 74-78, 80-89, and 92-101 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Appl. Publ'n No. 2002-0152332 ("*Rensin*") in view of U.S. Patent Appl. Publ'n No. 2004-0093317 ("*Swan*"). These rejections are addressed below.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 5-6, 24-25, 54-55, 70-71, and 88-89 as being indefinite for containing the trademark/trade name "ActiveX" or "Netscape." Applicants have canceled these rejected claims and therefore request reconsideration of the remaining claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The determination of whether an invention is or is not obvious is a legal conclusion based on underlying factual inquiries including: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art; and (4) objective evidence of nonobviousness. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 82 U.S.P.Q.2D 1385 (2007) (citing *Graham v. John Deere, Inc.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18, 86 S.Ct. 684, 15 L.Ed.2d 545, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459, 465 (1966)). The Examiner has the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and showing that the prior art teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations. *In re Glaug*, 815 F.2d 1335, 1338, 62 U.S.P.Q.2d 1151,

1152-53 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Moreover, the Examiner's obviousness analysis should be made explicit. *See generally, KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 82 U.S.P.Q.2D 1385 (2007). That is, rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *Id.*

A. U.S. Patent Appl. Publ'n No. 2002-0152332 ("*Rensin*")

Rensin discloses a way for populating online forms using contact information from a favorites list comprised of the most-recently-used contact data and/or a user-created list of favorite contacts. *Rensin*, Paragraphs [0044] and [0049]; Fig. 5. That is, in *Rensin*, the system can automatically populate online forms with contact information that the user selects from a list of favorite data records or from the most recently used data records. *Id.* If the desired contact information is not in the favorites list, the user can browse the contact records to choose the appropriate contact information:

Software plug-in 27 implements the following functions: (1) automatically fills on-line forms with data records saved in a local database of a handheld Internet appliance; (2) automatically fills on-line forms with favorite and most frequently used data records prior to displaying the on-line forms on handheld Internet appliance 20; and (3) retrieves a data record from a local database in handheld Internet appliance 20 to fill out an on-line form of a web site displayed on handheld Internet appliance 20.

Rensin, Paragraph [0049].

B. U.S. Patent Appl. Publ'n No. 2004-0093317 ("*Swan*")

Swan discloses a centralized system for maintaining and distributing contact information to multiple end users (e.g., personal computers or PDAs). *Swan*, Paragraphs [0013], [0053], [0062]-[0064], and [0081]. The centralized system can retrieve contact information, format the contact information based on the needs of the end user, and transmit the formatted contact information to the end user:

The foregoing description pertains to the inputting and updating of contact information by various contacts 14-17. At the same time, various end users 21-25 will be communicating with hub 12 in order to obtain the contact information input by contacts 14-17. Generally speaking, an end user 21 will provide either a contact identification code or search criteria to hub 12. Based on that information, hub 12 will: retrieve contact information for the indicated contact, format the contact information based on the needs of the end user 21, and transmit the formatted contact information to the end user 21. Software at the end user 21's terminal preferably automatically saves and/or displays the received contact information based on settings selected by the end user 21.

Swan, Paragraph [0081].

One of the motivations underlying *Swan* is to provide a centralized contact management system that can provide properly formatted contact information to various personal information manager programs irrespective of the various platforms. *Id.* *Swan* further discloses that contact information is retrieved from the centralized system by using a contact identifier. *Id.* at [0096]. A contact identifier is a field of contact information such as a phone number, email address, or an assigned identification code uniquely identifying each contact. *Id.* To retrieve the correct contact information, the user enters the *unique* contact identifier to access and retrieve the desired contact information. *Id.* That is, the unique contact identifier directly maps to a specific contact, i.e., it is a one-to-one mapping.

C. Rejection of Claims 1, 4, and 9-18

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4-6, and 9-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. Applicants have canceled Claims 5 and 6 and amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that currently pending Claims 1, 4, and 9-18 are not obvious in light of *Rensin* and *Swan* for at least the reasons set forth below and accordingly request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

i. Rejection of Independent Claim 1

Rensin and *Swan* do not disclose all of the recitations of independent Claim 1 whether considered alone or in combination. *Rensin* discloses a system *for selecting contact data from a*

favorites list or by browsing contact records to choose the appropriate contact information.

Rensin, Paragraphs [0044] and [0049]; Fig. 5. However, *Rensin* does not allow a user to enter one or more alphanumeric characters into a field of a web page of a web application, and to search “the contact data using interface software for more than one or more sets set of contact data matching the entered alphanumeric characters using the mapping data . . . [and to display] more than one or more sets set of contact data that match the entered alphanumeric characters” as recited in amended Claim 1. Thus, *Rensin* does not teach or suggest each of the recitations of Claim 1, a void which *Swan* does not overcome.

Swan discloses a centralized system for maintaining and distributing contact information to multiple end users. *Swan*, Paragraphs [0013], [0053], [0062]-[0064], and [0081]. The centralized system can retrieve contact information, format the contact information based on the needs of the end user, and transmit the formatted contact information to the end user. *Swan* discloses that contact information is retrieved by using a unique contact identifier. *Id.* at Paragraph [0096]. A unique contact identifier is a field containing contact information such as a phone number, email address, or a uniquely assigned identification code. *Id.* To retrieve the desired contact information, *the user enters a unique contact identifier that maps to a specific contact record for retrieval.* That is, the unique contact identifier maps to a specific contact, i.e., it does not search the contact data using interface software for more than one set of contact data matching an entered alphanumeric characters, as recited independent Claim 1. *Rather, Swan provides for a one-to-one mapping from the unique identifier to the desired contact data.* Thus, *Swan* does not fulfill the deficiencies of *Rensin*.

In part, this is because of one of the recitations of the present application that provides enhancements over *Rensin* and *Swan*. For instance, as recited in Claim 1, the various embodiments include a feature that allows a user to enter one or more alphanumeric characters into a field of a web page of a web application, and to search the contact data for more than one set of contact data matching the entered alphanumeric characters. This feature recited in amended Claim 1 provides an enhancement over *Rensin* and *Swan* that makes it very convenient for the user to search for and select a set of contact data to populate the web page. That is, the features of the present application do not require extensive interaction with the software running

on the computing device or require that the user select from a preconfigured favorites list or take the time browse all the data records to select the appropriate contact information to populate the online form. Moreover, the features of the present application provide for the capability for more than a single contact to be displayed as a contact data selection by entering just a few alphanumeric characters. This difference is illustrated in Fig. 5B of the present application. For instance, the user could enter "Jo" as the search term in the name field. Some embodiments of the present application would then search for all contacts with "jo" in the name, and, in the example, four names would be returned all having "Jo" in somewhere in their names: Seth Johnson; Dr. Sam Jones; James Jopplin; and Charles Jobs. The user can then select from the four names containing "Jo." At least this enhancement recited in independent Claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by *Rensin* or *Swan* whether considered alone or in combination.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that independent Claim 1 is patentable over *Rensin* and *Swan* and therefore respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claim 1 be withdrawn.

i. Rejection of Dependent Claims 4 and 9-18

Dependent Claims 4 and 9-18 depend from independent Claim 1. These dependent claims include all of the recitations of the corresponding base claim and any intervening claims plus their additional recitations that further distinguish the art applied in the rejection. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 4 and 9-18 are not obvious in view of *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

D. Rejection of Claims 19, 23, 26, 28, 50, 53, 56-65, 67-69, 74-78, 80-87, and 92-101

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 19, 23-26, 28-30, 50, 53-65, 67-71, 74-78, 80-89, and 92-101 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. In response, Claims 24-25, 54-55, 70-71, and 88-89 have been canceled and Claims 26, 50, 65, 78, and 84 have been amended. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 19, 23, 26, 28, 50, 53, 56-65, 67-69, 74-78, 80-87, and 92-101 are not obvious in light of *Rensin* and *Swan*

for at least the reasons set forth below. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

i. Rejection of Independent Claims 19, 26, 50, 65, 78, and 84

Independent Claims 19, 26, 50, 65, 78, and 84 include the same recitation and are therefore discussed jointly. As amended, each of the above-mentioned independent claims includes the recitation that enables the embodiments to “display more than one set of contact data matching the one or more alphanumeric characters entered” by the user. This recitation is neither taught nor suggested by the combination of *Rensin* and *Swan*.

Rensin discloses a system for selecting contact data from a favorites list or by browsing contact records to choose the appropriate contact information. *Rensin*, Paragraphs [0044] and [0049]; Fig. 5. That is, in *Rensin*, the system can automatically populate online forms with contact information that the user selects from a list of favorite data records or from the most recently used data records. *Id.* If the desired contact information is not in the favorites list, the user can browse the contact records to choose the appropriate contact information. Thus, *Rensin* does not disclose at least the recitation that enables the embodiments to “display more than one set of contact data matching the one or more alphanumeric characters entered.” Furthermore, *Swan* does not fulfill the deficiencies of *Rensin*.

As previously discussed, *Swan* discloses a centralized contact management system that can provide properly formatted contact information to various personal information manager programs irrespective of the various platforms. *Id.* *Swan* further discloses that contact information can be retrieved from the centralized system by using a contact identifier. *Id.* at [0096]. A contact identifier is a field of contact information such as a phone number, email address, or an assigned identification code uniquely identifying each contact. *Id.* To retrieve the correct contact information, the user enters the *unique* contact identifier to access and retrieve the desired contact information. *Id.* That is, the unique contact identifier directly maps to a specific contact, i.e., it is a one-to-one mapping from the unique contact identifier to the desired contact data.

Thus, neither *Rensin* nor *Swan*, whether considered alone or in combination disclose the

recitation that allows the embodiments to “display more than one set of contact data matching the one or more alphanumeric characters entered,” as recited in independent Claims 19, 26, 50, 65, 78, and 84. This recitation allows a user to enter one or more alphanumeric characters into a field of a web page of a web application, and to search the contact data for more than one set of contact data matching the entered alphanumeric characters. The more than one set of matching contact data is then displayed to the user. For instance, as shown in Fig. 5B, the user could enter “Jo” as the search term in the name field. Some embodiments of the present application would then search for all contacts with “jo” in the name, and, in the example, four names would be returned all having “Jo” in somewhere in their names: Seth Johnson; Dr. Sam Jones; James Jopplin; and Charles Jobs. The user can then select from the four names containing “Jo” to automatically populate an electronic form. This recitation is not taught or suggested by *Rensin* or *Swan*.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that independent Claims 19, 26, 50, 65, 78, and 84 are patentable over *Rensin* and *Swan* and therefore respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claims 19, 26, 50, 65, 78, and 84 be withdrawn.

ii. Rejection of Dependent Claims 23, 28, 53, 56-64, 67-69, 74-77, 80-83, 85-87, and 92-101

Claims 23, 28, 53, 56-64, 67-69, 74-77, 80-83, 85-87, and 92-101 depend from independent Claims 19, 26, 50, 65, 78, and 84, respectively and include all of the recitations of the corresponding base claim and any intervening claims plus their additional recitations that further distinguish the art applied in the rejection. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claims 19, 26, 50, 65, 78, and 84, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 23, 28, 53, 56-64, 67-69, 74-77, 80-83, 85-87, and 92-101 are further patentable over *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that Claims 1, 4, 9-19, 23, 26, 28, 50, 53, 56-65, 67-69, 74-78, 80-87,

Appl. No.: 10/607,907
Amdt. dated October 15, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 30, 2007

and 92-101 have been amended or canceled as necessary to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1, 4, 9-19, 23, 26, 28, 50, 53, 56-65, 67-69, 74-78, 80-87, and 92-101; withdrawal of all rejections; and a Notice of Allowance be issued for all pending claims.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dane A. Baltich/

Dane A. Baltich
Registration No. 55,274

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON October 15, 2007.